SOCIAL SCIENCES

LIBRARY
JAN

NATIONAL REVIEW

20 Cents

January 12, 1957

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

Atoms for Peace—or War?

DAVID SHEA TEEPLE

The Year in American Literature

JOHN ABBOT CLARK

Notes on the Papal Message

FRANK S. MEYER

Articles and Reviews by · · · E. v. KUEHNELT-LEDDIHN
ROBERT PHELPS · ALLAN P. SINDLER · WM. F. BUCKLEY, JR.
WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM · SAM M. JONES · L. BRENT BOZELL

For the Record

When it was first hinted that Marshal Tito would be invited to Washington to confer with President Eisenhower this year, the reaction was immediate and hostile, both on Capitol Hill and in the nation at large. Nothwithstanding, NATIONAL REVIEW has it on good authority that a formal invitation has gone out to the Yugoslav leader and that it has been accepted.

How did we do in 1956?—some year-end statistics: American exports were up nearly 20 per cent (they approached $18.5 billion) and imports were up 12 per cent (nearly $13 billion).... Our farm exports will equal the 1919 record of $4.1 billion, an increase of 30 per cent.... The 1956 boom, say government statisticians, was sparked by record business spending of $35 billion.... Although house building slumped, some $44 billion—a new high—was spent on construction as a whole.... But small business was in trouble. With an estimated 12,750 failures, 1956 was the worst year for the "little" manfacturer and retailer since 1941.

At the year's end, the average gross weekly earnings of factory workers stood at a record $82.42, up 3.6 per cent over a year ago, and five million wage earners are assured new pay hikes in 1957 under two-year and longer labor contracts negotiated in 1956.... Consumer credit hit a new peak of $40.2 billion, but the rate of growth is slowing.... American businesses paid out $12.2 billion in fringe benefits in 1956, which means that the ratio of benefits to wages and salaries is roughly 6.5 per cent.... U.S. steel-making capacity increased for the tenth year in a row; it is now 45 per cent greater than in 1945; and American shipbuilders entered the year with enough orders to keep operations close to capacity for three years.

The American Public Power Association has just issued a nine-page booklet aimed at reviving the Gore Bill for government development of atomic power which was narrowly defeated in the last Congress. The booklet lays down conditions for deciding between public and private projects that would invariably favor the former.... The Administration is reported ready to capitulate to the public power lobby's demand for government development of two major projects, one at the John Day site on the Columbia River, the second at Pleasant Valley on the Snake River. Reported reason for the reversal: the defeat of Republican Senatorial candidates Arthur Langlie in Washington and Douglas McKay in Oregon.

Congressman Walter, co-author of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, has sounded a warning against changing immigration laws to give Hungarian refugees now admitted under the so-called "parole" clause permanent resident status. Rep. Walter insists the background of the refugees should first be checked for Communist connections.

Algerian Communists are making an all-out bid to take over the leadership of the 26-month-old Algerian rebellion, French intelligence sources say. The high command of the "National Liberation Front," which masterminded the revolt, was seriously disrupted by the capture of five of its leaders in October and by the surrender of two others in recent months.... One unexpected side result of the Saar settlement: neither France nor West Germany will require nationals of the other country to present passports at the border.

Most of the Russian tanks used to crush the Hungarian revolt are reported to have left the country. At any rate, observers say they are no longer in evidence in Budapest.... No reprisals so far are reported against the 250 Hungarian writers who signed a statement last week attacking the Soviet Union for "staining the [Hungarian] revolution with blood."... A returning Japanese war prisoner claims a Russian prison guard told him slave labor camps in Northern Siberia were being prepared for Hungarian deportees. The repatriate estimated that one million prisoners (Ukrainians, Poles, Germans and Japanese) are still held in Siberian prisons.

NATIONAL REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

EDITOR and PUBLISHER: Wm. F. Buckley, Jr.

EDITORS

L. Brent Bozell — James Burnham
John Chamberlain — Willmoore Kendall
Suzanne La Follette — William S. Schlamm

PRODUCTION EDITOR: Mabel Wood

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT: Sam M. Jones

ASSOCIATES

Priscilla L. Buckley — Frank S. Meyer
Jonathan Mitchell — Morrie Ryskind

CONTRIBUTORS

C. D. Batchelor, John C. Caldwell, Frank Chodorov, John Abbot Clark, Forrest Davis, A. Derso, Max Eastman, Medford Evans, Karl Hess, John D. Kreuttner, J. B. Matthews, Gerhart Niemeyer, Revilo Oliver, E. Merrill Root, Freda Utley, Richard M. Weaver, Gen. Charles A. Willoughby

FOREIGN CONTRIBUTORS

Geneva: Wilhelm Roepke
London: F. A. Voigt — *Madrid*: J. Dervin
Munich: E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn

BUSINESS MANAGER: Theodore A. Driscoll

Contents JANUARY 12, 1957 VOL. III, NO. 2

THE WEEK 27

ARTICLES

Atoms for Peace—or War? ..... David Shea Teeple 35
The Year in American Literature ..... John Abbot Clark 39

DEPARTMENTS

For the Record 26
From Washington Straight ..... Sam M. Jones 32
National Trends ..... L. Brent Bozell 33
Letter from the Continent ..... E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn 38
The Ivory Tower ..... Wm. F. Buckley, Jr. 41
Principles and Heresies ..... Frank S. Meyer 42
Arts and Manners ..... William S. Schlamm 43
To the Editor 47

BOOKS IN REVIEW

A Seasonal Tonic ..... Robert Phelps 44
Free of Twaddle ..... Revilo Oliver 45
In Defense of the System ..... Allan P. Sindler 45
Half-Forgotten Lives ..... Russell Kirk 46
Priest and Convert ..... Godfrey P. Schmidt 46
A Democracy Dies ..... Frances Beck 46

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly, except second and third weeks in August, at Orange, Conn., by National Weekly, Inc. Copyrighted 1957 in the U.S.A. by National Weekly, Inc. Second-class mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.

EDITORIAL AND SUBSCRIPTION OFFICES:
211 East 37th St.
New York 16, N.Y.
Telephone: MUrray Hill 2-0941

RATES, Twenty cents a copy, $7.00 a year, $13.00 for two years. Foreign, $9.00 a year; Canada, $8.00 a year.

The editors cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless return postage, or better, a stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed. Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

The WEEK

● Secretary Dulles' "Plan" (see editorial below) is, in its present undefined stage, both grossly inadequate and grossly evasive. It says little about how to prevent Communist penetration of the kind presently afflicting Syria—beyond talismanic invocations of foreign aid; and less about what to do in the event the Soviet Union successfully colonizes a Mideast power in such fashion as to preclude the possibility that it would be termed, under the Dulles Plan, an "armed invasion"—and that kind of colonization is distinctively the Soviet mode. In future days Mr. Dulles may spell out his proposal. Perhaps it will reflect a knowledge of the nature and techniques of the enemy.

● When the legislature assembles, Rousseau wrote, all power in effect lapses, and the most exalted executive official ceases to be any more sacrosanct than the humblest citizen. For if there be a general will (Rousseau argues) its expressions come from the legislature, not the bureaucrats; they are there merely to do its bidding. That is the frame of mind in which we should like to see the new Congress go about its work. And by "work" we specifically include the most important contemporary function of legislatures throughout the world: to do nothing—if that is what it takes to keep the army of social engineers, levellers and snoopers at bay. And, joy of joys when it happens, to *un*do things that army has done in the past. Our slogan for the Eighty-fifth Congress, in short: *No* mammoth programs; *no* honeymoon with the White House; *no* acquisitions of new functions.

● However paradoxical it may sound, it is so that Northern ideologists are responsible for the outbreak of violence in the South and that, nevertheless, no one is responsible for that violence save those who commit it. Southerners guilty of shooting stray bullets into buses filled with Negroes in Montgomery, Alabama, of flogging a bandleader in Camden, South Carolina, of burning down the house of a Negro minister in Tallahassee, Florida, can rail against politicalization of the Supreme Court, against the perversion of the Constitution, against the abstractions of radical

anthropologists, and every word of it may be true: but nothing that they say can atone for, or in any way mitigate, their debasing brutality.

● Although the revolt in Sumatra continued bloodless during its first two weeks, the central Indonesian government has been stepping up military preparations, threats and economic sanctions. The dissident leaders continued in control of central and southern Sumatra, but had lost their hold in the north. Meanwhile there were new outbreaks in the primarily Christian districts of Celebes, and as usual in the Moluccas. It became clear that along with protest against the failures and corruption of the central government, the revolts were a kind of "states' rights" expression, looking toward the federated Indonesia, with local autonomy, which had been the original goal and promise of the independence movement, but which the Javanese-dominated national government, as soon as the Dutch left, promptly dropped in favor of a plan of rigid centralization.

● The contents of the annual report by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover to the Attorney General emphasize the awesome efficiency of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—and reveal that the national crime rate is at an all-time high. No less than 2,534,000 major crimes (defined as murder, negligent manslaughter, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny and automobile theft) were committed in the United States last year, an increase of 12 per cent over 1955. The report, and its meaning, have had little impact—at least on those who were not, during the year, robbed, raped or assaulted. Indeed, it is a sign of the times that Angelo LaMarca, sentenced to die for the kidnap-murder of the Weinberger baby, has received hundreds of letters of condolence from those who, presumably, see no reason why a man should die merely for killing a baby. Is the reaction of the American people to crime at home part of the same callousness toward crime abroad that shines through our foreign policy?

● In a sober and analytical speech before the Canadian Association of Manufacturers, Admiral Ben Moreell, as eloquent and keen a spokesman for a free economy as is actively engaged in American industry today, declared that the welfarist socialist principles that the Roosevelt Administration adopted with such trepidation in 1930 were finally institutionalized in 1954 when, in his State of the Union message, President Eisenhower pronounced them no longer "a political issue." Brushing aside semantic obfuscations, Admiral Moreell declared with characteristic forthrightness that production cannot be controlled without controlling producers; that men do not hand over their profits to other men unless they are forced to do so; that "socialism is based on coercion and on the control of some men by other men. . . . The slaveholder does not really care about owning another man; what he wants is the ownership of the products of another man's labor."

● Professor Warren Nutter of the University of Virginia, reporting the preliminary findings of a National Bureau of Economics study, told the American Economics Association: "Soviet industry seems still to be roughly three and a half decades behind us in levels of output and about five and a half decades in levels of per capita output." For the dupes of Soviet statistics and the hypnotized worshippers of Five Year Plans, Dr. Nutter had a still colder douche: "Over the Soviet era as a whole, Soviet industries have generally lost historical ground to their American counterparts—the lags have generally increased —in terms of both total and per capita output. Growth . . . has been slower in Soviet than in American industry."

● Admiral Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, says that, no matter how unsuspecting the United States may be if and when the enemy pounces, we could lay waste the aggressor's homeland in a matter of twenty-four hours. The Soviet Union will continue to work for control of the world; but she will not, the Admiral conjectures, risk an armed attack upon us unless she comes to doubt our retaliatory power, or our will to exercise it; or unless, in her fanaticism, she elects to wound us even at the cost of her own destruction—*and that would be the cost,* says Admiral Burke.

● In December, track-laying (chiefly by slave laborers) was completed on a 420 mile spur linking Amoy, the Chinese coast city opposite Nationalist-held Kinmen (Quemoy), with the Chekiang-Kiangsi railway. The Communists are at present working on an additional 72 mile track between Amoy and Foochow, the other principal city of the costal plain that most directly threatens Taiwan. Heretofore the only land link between this area and the hinterland has been a precarious mountain road. With sea communications subject to Nationalist attack, the Communist logistic support of Amoy and Foochow has been severely handicapped. Once the spur is in operation, a twenty-car train can carry the load of 450 trucks, and the five days of the motor haul will be reduced to two. Saboteurs, please note.

● It calls itself the Bill of Rights Fund. Its chairman is Corliss Lamont and its counsel Philip Wittenberg. Its proud boast, set forth in a handsomely-printed nine-page folder, is that it has in large part financed the epidemic of litigiousness that, through the years

since 1946, has slowed up and impeded and sometimes wholly defeated our effort to protect our internal security against the Communists and their apologists. And any reader who wishes the epidemic to continue and spread can send his contribution to the "Fund's" offices at 450 Riverside Drive.

The Dulles Plan

The Administration's new proposal for an enlarged American commitment in the Middle East has been given spectacular publicity, but—up to the time of our writing—not much specification. A general judgment on it must wait until its meaning has been amplified in terms of exactly what, how much, when, and where. Our preliminary comments will be confined to certain problems posed by the initial press releases.

According to these, a plan to guide American Mideast policy has been formulated by Secretary Dulles and will be submitted for appropriate Executive and Legislative action. The plan seems to have three main divisions: a) Congress will be asked to approve a resolution authorizing the President, as Commander-in-Chief, to oppose by military action any Soviet armed aggression against any Mideast nation, provided that the government of that nation requests such assistance; b) Congress will be asked to vote economic aid to the Mideast area under a large-scale project aiming to block Soviet economic penetration; c) Soviet political penetration will be opposed by various measures (unlisted) and by pushing for amicable solution of the Mideast boundary, guerrilla warfare, refugee and similar problems.

1. The military part of Secretary Dulles' Plan, the most important part, is surely trying to solve the wrong problem, as if a man should put a fence around his yard to keep out mosquitoes. The President is to be authorized to take military measures in case, a) a Soviet military force invades a Mideast nation, and b) the government of that nation asks the United States for help. But the chances are many to one against such a double eventuality. The Soviet move into the Middle East is being accomplished not by direct military invasion, but by a gradual and *invited* military entry prepared by political and economic infiltration. In dealing with this, the real Mideast threat, the new Plan apparently offers no guidance.

2. The proposal for advance congressional authorization of the use of military force is similar to the proposal made by the Administration, and voted in January 1955 by Congress, in the case of Taiwan. It is an unhappy thing for our country and the world that such measures should be on any agenda. Our Constitution assigns to the Legislature the power of declaring war, and NATIONAL REVIEW is in general opposed to any delegation, even partial, of that power. At the same time, if we face both the technological and the political realities of the twentieth century, we see on the one hand that the military fate of a nation can be decided in a few hours, and on the other that modern wars do not wait for declarations. In fact, Bolshevism in its drive for world power has destroyed the line between peace and war. In historical substance we are at war *now* with the Soviet Union, so that in voting any sort of military action against it Congress is actually dealing with the present even if the resolution is phrased in the future tense.

By an advance reference to Congress, President Eisenhower is certainly acting more in the spirit (if not quite in the letter) of the Constitution than President Roosevelt on the destroyer deal with Britain or President Truman in ordering military action in Korea, both of which moves were taken in total disregard of Congress.

We believe, however, that Congress should not leave the check altogether blank. Congress should insist on a strict delimitation of the area and condi-

tions to which the authorization should apply. The resolution should provide for immediate reference to Congress if emergency military action is taken, with the convening of Congress if then in recess; and should be subject to a time limit of not more than one year, unless extended by further congressional action.

3. The Administration's purpose is to make publicly clear, to enemies as well as friends, an American "vital interest" in the Middle East. The initial pronouncements, however, leave exceedingly vague just what that vital interest extends to. As we see it, the United States must be concerned to prevent an enemy or the agent of an enemy: a) from getting control of Middle Eastern oil—the world's largest known supply; b) from blocking the Suez Canal route, which is necessary, directly and indirectly, to our well-being and security; c) from prohibiting our use of air bases that are at present essential to our strategic deployment; d) from outflanking Europe and taking over the bridge to Africa by acquiring Mideast positions of strength on land or sea. Against these contingencies our own national security dictates that we should act, and as a last resort must fight.

But the proper interest of the government of the United States does not extend much beyond these strategic essentials. Our government has no obligation—and no ability and right—to settle all the seven-thousand-year social, economic, religious and political problems of that star-crossed region. Our government cannot feed every hungry Egyptian, clothe every ragged Bedouin, educate every illiterate Yemenite and soothe every fanatic Jew—nor is it our government's business to do so.

The lack of definition with which the Dulles Mideast Plan is being put forth suggests the ease with which it could develop into a huge, uncritical foreign-aid giveaway, one more Kermess of bureaucrats, serving the interests neither of the United States nor of the area, and in the end only softening up the Middle East for deeper Soviet penetration. Indeed, off in the wings of the political stage, you can almost hear Paul Hoffman and Chester Bowles champing at the bit.

4. As a final query in these first comments, we wonder why, if a grandiose Mideast Plan is in fact necessary, proper and possible, it waited until now. Why not a year ago? Why not, at the latest, when Nasser purchased Communist arms, or when he seized the Canal Company? Even a bare announcement, in June or August, of an American Plan on the Mideast would probably have forestalled the Egyptian, Israeli and Anglo-French operations that have had such sorry and expensive consequences. Is Anthony Eden right in his contention that it took an act as drastic as the Suez invasion to spur the United States to action of any kind?

Lost Lines

Lines from the Pope's Christmas Message which the *New York Times* deemed unfit to print:

"We must with deepest sadness mourn the help given by some Catholics, both ecclesiastical and lay, to the tactics of obfuscation, calculated to bring about a result that they themselves did not intend.

"How can they fail to see that such is the aim of all that insincere activity which hides under the name of 'talks' and 'meetings'?

"Why *enter* a discussion, for that matter, without a common language?

"How is it possible to meet if the paths are divergent; that is, if one party rejects or denies the common absolute values, thereby making all 'co-existence in truth' unattainable?

"Out of respect for the name of Christian, compliance with such tactics should cease; for, as the Apostle warns, *it is inconsistent to wish to sit at the table of God and at that of his enemies* (I Corinthians X, 21).

"And if there still be any vacillating spirits, notwithstanding the black testimony of ten years of cruelty, the blood just shed and the immolation of many lives sacrificed by a martyred people should finally convince them."

Easy Does It . . .

A committee of the American Association for the Advancement of Science reported last week to the parent body on some "Social Aspects of Science." The report did not summon scientists to take over society, hence it is not cause for immediate alarm. It was ambiguous in many respects, forthright in others; in tone it was moderate and good-natured—even deferential, here and there.

The scientists are disturbed by a number of developments affecting science. The immediate usefulness of science to industry and war is, the committee notes, by way of being a recent discovery. In 1930, expenditures for scientific research amounted to $166 million. Today, commerce and the military having discovered its instantaneously exploitable potential, we are spending more than five billion a year on scientific research.

This concentration has resulted in uneven strides forward as between the various branches of science—overemphasis on some, a neglect of others. Pure, abstract science, because it isn't so readily monetized, has been undernourished, with the result that we are living, the Committee complains, on scientific propositions twenty-five years old, which, for scientific propositions, is absolutely senile. Unless we devote more time to seminal research, we shall one day run out of

the possibilities of applied science based on existing principles. We want a voice, the scientists are saying, in the shape that research takes, so we can bring our expertise to bear on the problems of balance.

Beyond that suggestion, a wholly reasonable one as far as we can see, the scientists get a little hazy in their recommendations. No one contends that a scientist, merely because he is a scientist, forfeits the right, in his role as a citizen, to suggest the proper use to which science should be put. But here is talk of something more—of the "role of the organizations of science," by which the scientists seem to have in mind the pressure-group potential of organized science, the maximization of their political and social power in behalf of a scientific, or scientistic (for here the terminology changes) approach to social problems. Why not? they ask. "Business and labor are not backward in presenting *their* opinions on social questions . . . There are many who think that the viewpoint of scientists should also be stated publicly . . . [Indeed, there is] pressing need that scientists concern themselves with social action."

We agree. That concern should take the form of striving to view the world as a world in which science plays an important, but not the most important role. It should take the form of guarding against a scientistic or naturalistic view of things, against the dimwitted presupposition that expertness in science postulates enlightenment in the world of values—the real world, the world of truths transcendent, and beauty.

Instantaneous Literature

Mr. Randall Jarrell (a particular favorite of ours, by the way—a confession which will produce mutual embarrassment) is always complaining, and most generally about the right things. Most recently about Instantaneous Literature . . .

"People have learned to process words . . . and the thoughts and attitudes they embody; they have learned to manufacture entertainment and uplift as efficiently as they manufacture anything else . . .

"We pay tens of millions of people to spend their lives lying to us, or telling us the truth, or supplying us with a nourishing medicinal compound of the two."

These word-makers "treat us exactly as advertisers treat the readers of advertisements—humor us, flatter our prejudices, pull our strings, show us that they know us for what they think us to be: impressionistic, emotional, ignorant, somewhat weak-minded common men. They fool us to the top of our bent; and, if we aren't fooled, they dismiss us as a statistically negligible minority.

"Advertisement is a wish modified, if at all, by the Pure Food and Drug Act. Take a loaf of ordinary white bread that one buys at the grocery. As you eat it you know that you are eating it, and not the blotter, because the blotter isn't so bland; yet in the world of advertisements, little boys ask their mothers not to put any jam on their bread, it tastes so good without.

"The principal difference between the modern age and those past is not technological improvement but the vast assault on everyone with 'Instant Literature.' . . .

"The more words there are, the simpler they get. The professional users of words process their product as if it were baby food and we babies; all we have to do is open our mouths and swallow."

Children's books of the future will be "a book that rocks the child to sleep, teaches her that Crime Doesn't Pay, can be used as a heating pad if the electric blanket breaks down, doesn't exceed 30 words, and has three-dimensional illustrations dyed with harmless vegetable coloring matter and flavored with synthetic vanilla. I hear the children of the future crying: 'Mother, read us another vanilla book!' "

Test Your Wit

1. The best thing that could happen for the health of the nation would be the abolition of sickness.

2. The best thing that could happen for the happiness of people in general would be the abolition of pain, disappointment and death.

3. The best thing that could happen for the prosperity of the world would be an agreement between capital and labor to let everybody share the profit and nobody carry the risks.

4. The best thing that could happen for the peace of the world would be an agreement between the U.S. and the Soviet Union to cease trying to dominate in a military or political way any part of the world outside of their possessions.

5. The best thing that could happen for the benefit of columnists would be agreement on the part of publishers to accept statements such as those above for publication and even to pay for them.

One of these five statements is by Eleanor Roosevelt. Which one? (Answer next week.)

NATIONAL REVIEW is proud to announce that Mr. John Chamberlain and Mr. L. Brent Bozell have joined the staff as editors.

Next week, NATIONAL REVIEW will publish an extended development by Mr. James Burnham of the thesis discussed in his last column. For that reason, his regular column, "The Third World War," does not appear in this issue.

from WASHINGTON *straight*

A NEWSLETTER

SAM M. JONES

Beau Geste or . . .?

Only the Congress of the United States has the power "*to declare war . . . to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of Nations. . . .*" U. S. Constitution, Section 8.

The President's desire for stand-by powers to engage this country in what could be a shooting war in the Middle East [see "The Dulles Plan," page 29] will meet considerable resistance, but Congress set a fateful precedent when it renounced its power and responsibility last year by passage of the Formosa Resolution. The situation in the Middle East is by no means comparable to Red China's threat to the Nationalists on Formosa, with whom this nation has a mutual defense pact. But the Administration's prefatory publicity has sought to draw a parallel. It has found few buyers on Capitol Hill. And, as Senator Mike Mansfield remarked, why should the President need the authority to "get us—alone—stuck out there," after having dropped the crisis on the United Nations' doorstep?

Senator Mansfield almost certainly speaks for the majority in the Congress and in the country, but it is not unlikely that the power and persuasiveness of the White House will prevail. Members of Congress are buffeted with the Administration argument that the stand-by power will, in addition to protecting our national and economic interests, have great psychological value as a *gesture* of warning to Russia and of reassurance to France and Britain. Some legislators are wondering whether a gesture will suffice.

Exodus

Chairman McMillan (Dem., S.C.) of the House District Committee is "ready and willing" to give precedence to the Davis Subcommittee's legislative recommendations on Washington's integration problems. But like other realists, he has no illusions, and only a hope that something can be done to make the school situation "as palliative as possible." The Davis report contained statistics illustrating an "appalling increase in juvenile delinquency" under forced integration; cited evidence showing disparity in ability and achievement between white and Negro children; declared that the number of cases of venereal disease among Negroes of school age is "astounding and tragic"; that sex problems are "a matter of vital concern"; that an "exodus of white residents to Virginia and Maryland . . . seriously threatens the educational, economic, cultural and social foundation." Subcommittee recommendations included the re-establishment of racially separated public schools on a "separate and equal basis."

The barrage of denunciation and charges of race-baiting which accompanied the revelations during the hearings has been stepped up to prevent any remote possibility of favorable congressional action. Two GOP subcommittee members (Hyde of Maryland and Miller of Nebraska) who failed to attend a single hearing have joined the NAACP-Liberal attack. The other Republican member (Broyhill of Virginia) suggested that conditions might be ameliorated within the framework of segregation. The *Washington Post* promptly branded Broyhill as an exposed segregationist, which in the *Post's* view will doubtless cause many of his constituents to "share anger and surprise."

Is Your TV Working?

Unable to sweep it under the rug, Labor lobbyists are making frantic efforts to tone down the forthcoming Senate investigation of racketeering in labor unions and misuse of union funds, which opens with an executive session January 15. Advance information indicates that the evidence accumulated by the full staff of the Senate Investigating Subcommittee is so conclusive of malfeasance and unvarnished crime on a grand scale that Chairman McClellan is prepared to ask for a record appropriation to continue the probe. Evidence has already been unearthed in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Minneapolis, Las Vegas, Los Angeles and Seattle of welfare-fund diversion, gangster domination of unions and divers criminal enterprises, including shakedowns, extortion and a union-owned chain of brothels. Committee sources are quietly confident that the pending disclosures will make the revelations of the famed Kefauver crime quiz sound like larceny in the dime store.

Independent Democrats

Although the Democratic leader of the Senate, Lyndon Johnson, has adopted a "wait and see" attitude before initiating a legislative or policy program for his party, some of his colleagues, in and out of office, are jumping the gun. What the Democratic Advisory Committee, ill-advisedly appointed by National Chairman Butler, will recommend, if anything, is unknown at this writing, but the creation of the committee was in itself an indication of intra-party impatience with the traditional leadership. House members are now getting into the act. Eleven Democratic Representatives have prepared a program looking toward the eventual peaceful liberation of the Soviet satellite countries. Rep. Reuss of Wisconsin, spokesman for the group, states his conviction that a wait and see policy toward satellite countries seeking freedom could cause disastrous explosions in those nations and touch off World War III. Neither Speaker Rayburn nor Senator Johnson has chosen to comment so far on this most recent sample of an independent, unofficial Democratic program. Incidents of this kind, however, may possibly accelerate the presentation of a program by the leadership before the rank and file and the ex-officio experts take off on various tangents.

NATIONAL TRENDS

L. BRENT BOZELL

The Administration Breaks the Law

The folks on Capitol Hill are as anxious to help the Hungarian refugees as anyone else. That goes without saying. But many of the legislators and staff experts on immigration matters are extremely critical of the way the problem has been handled.—*i.e.* (say some of the critics), the *wrong* law was used in the beginning, and *i.e.* (say the others), there was *no* law available to admit the Hungarians after the first 6,500 had been let in, the point of this latter contention being that the Administration should have called a special session of Congress in November rather than take matters into its own hands. The dispute and the story behind it are not, be forewarned, uncomplicated; but let's have a go at it anyway, for a number of important questions are at stake which have been generally overlooked by the daily press.

Interestingly enough, the initiative in granting Hungarian refugees a haven in the U. S. was taken, not by Eleanor Roosevelt, but by that long-standing *bête noire* of the Liberals, Mr. Scott McLeod, chief of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. On November 8, McLeod called together representatives from State, Defense and the CIA, Gen. Joseph Swing of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and staff members of congressional immigration committees, to consider invoking the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, of which McLeod was administrator. Several other nations had already acted to help the refugees, and the U. S., McLeod argued, should start doing its share.

The Refugee Relief Act had been designed to admit to the U. S., on a permanent basis, "escapees" from Communist-held territories in excess of the area quotas stipulated by the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952. Approximately 6,500 visas, McLeod reported, were still available for escapees residing in the area Austria-Germany, and these could be given to the Hungarians. Restrictive provisions of the Refugee Act, however, presented a number of difficulties: since the Act would expire on December 31, the mandatory security investigations that normally took several months, or more, would have to be completed in several weeks; "assurances" by U. S. citizens against the immigrants' becoming public charges would have to be procured for each case, which would also take time; the Austrian government would have to be persuaded to guarantee the readmission to Austria of any immigrant who falsified his application for a visa; and, finally, the Secretaries of State and Defense would have to exercise their authority to waive the requirement that a complete history of each immigrant be available covering the two-year period preceding his application.

The "Parole" Provision

Except in the matter of the security investigations, the conferees agreed that the obstacles could be overcome —and, as it turned out, they were: the law was complied with. The congressional representatives, however, opposed McLeod's plan largely on the grounds that the security check contemplated by the Act was impossible in the time available. They proposed, instead, that the Hungarians be let in under the so-called "parole" section of the McCarran-Walter Act. Parolees are not required by law to undergo *any* security investigation prior to admission; but since they do not get permanent visas, they are deportable by the Attorney General at his discretion should they be found to be undesirable after arrival.

McLeod overrode the congressional objections and elected to move ahead under the Refugee Relief Act. A few hours later, the White House announced that President Eisenhower had decided to issue permanent visas to 5,000 Hungarians.

At this writing, it is hard to tell whether the 5,000—and the additional 1,500 who were later given visas under the Refugee Relief Act—were adequately investigated. Some of the congressional observers who were on the spot in Austria say no. They contend that checks were made where possible before visas were issued; but if checks were impossible, the visas were issued anyway. Administration officials, on the other hand, insist that security checks on the Hungarians were actually *more* satisfactory than those that had taken much longer in the past. They cite the fact that frequently an applicant's story could be cross-checked within hours by fellow-refugees in the locality, whereas rapid verification is all but impossible in the case of the individual who has sneaked across the border by himself. Collusion among refugees was, of course, a possibility, but one that could be at least partly guarded against by interrogation of non-referred refugees from, say, the applicant's former place of residence, or perhaps the factory at which he had worked.

In any event, the charge cannot very well be made that "the law" was disregarded by the speeded-up security investigations. As is its wont in such matters, Congress left security enforcement under the Refugee Relief Act pretty much up to the Executive Branch. The Act provides that security investigations "in each case shall be conducted in a manner and in such time as the investigative agency or agencies shall determine to be necessary." This entitled the State Department and the Immigration and Naturalization Services to do substantially what they pleased by way of revising security regulations to accommodate the situation.

Intent of Congress

Toward the end of November, the Refugee Relief Act quota had been exhausted, and the Administration turned to the "parole" device to let in additional refugees. Notwithstanding that the solution had been recommended earlier by congressional staff members, it would seem to be at this juncture that a serious case of Executive law-breaking occurred. Fifteen thousand refugees, without visas, were authorized to be admitted to the

U. S. under the following provision of the McCarran-Walter Act:

> The Attorney General may in his discretion parole into the United States *temporarily* under such conditions as he may prescribe for emergent reasons or for reasons deemed strictly in the public interest any alien applying for admission to the United States, *but such parole of such alien shall not be regarded as an admission of the alien* and when the purposes of such parole shall, in the opinion of the Attorney General, have been served *the alien shall forthwith return or be returned to the custody from which he was paroled and thereafter his case shall continue to be dealt with in the same manner as that of any other applicant for admission to the United States.* [Emphasis added]

The question is whether this section can legitimately be interpreted as authorizing the admission of 15,000 aliens *en masse*, who, everyone concerned admits, will be allowed in one way or another to remain in this country permanently. One thing is sure: Congress, when it enacted the law, did not *intend* that such use should be made of the parole provision. The legislative history of the section makes clear that it was designed to take care of the individual hardship case—the traveler who loses his passport, the stranded seaman whose ship has gone down and such like. What the McCarran-Walter Act did was to codify a long-standing practice of Executive clemency—a practice that immigration officials like to illustrate with the case of Madame Chiang Kai-shek. On several occasions, it seems, Mme. Chiang arrived at West Coast ports in full pursuit of her "principle" of not carrying official travel documents. A hasty order from Washington to "parole" her was the only thing that prevented zealous immigration authorities from tossing China's First Lady back on the boat.

Aside from being designed for individual cases, the parole provision was intended to give the alien a *temporary* haven—*i.e.*, failing private legislation which would entitle him to apply for citizenship, the section contemplates that the alien will eventually leave the United States. In the case of the Hungarians, however, no one expects or would want them to be sent back to Europe. They are being admitted with the clear intention of permitting them to stay for good. The Attorney General has, in other words, presented Congress with a *fait accompli* to which Congress must now respond by legislating 15,000 visaless Hungarians the right to permanent residence.

The point you hear made on Capitol Hill is not that Congress would have been less anxious than the Executive Branch to admit the 15,000, but rather that due respect for the law and the Constitution requires that Congress, not the Executive Branch, make the decision. If Congress had been called into special session in mid-November, there is little doubt it would have enacted the legislation necessary for admission, and done it quickly. Conceivably, of course, it would have balked; but that, whether we like it or not, is Congress' prerogative under its constitutional grant of exclusive jurisdiction over immigration.

Many Not "Freedom Fighters"

And there is more involved here than non-observation of constitutional procedures. It is generally conceded that a substantial number of the refugees from Hungary are not "freedom fighters" at all, but, if you like, free-loaders—persons who have always wanted to emigrate to the U. S. and who took advantage of the rebellion and border-opening to do so. The admission of such persons implies significant substantive changes in U. S. immigration policy. These people are really no different from thousands of others living in the satellite areas (and from many pre-Hungary escapees residing in Western Europe) who are prevented from coming to the U. S. by, *inter alia*, a deliberate U. S. immigration policy to exclude them. It may be argued—as your correspondent would certainly argue—that the McCarran-Walter quotas *ought* to be more generous for Eastern Europeans; it remains, however, that Congress is on record as feeling otherwise about it—pretty definitely so, as witness its overruling of President Truman's veto of the McCarran-Walter Act in 1952. Perhaps Congress has since changed its mind, but only Congress can tell us about that.

There is one difficulty with this analysis that we had better face, namely: that Congressman Walter and Senator Eastland, the respective chairmen of the House and Senate Immigration Subcommittees, have both indicated their approval of "paroling" the Hungarians. One answer is that the opinions of two members of Congress, however, relevantly situated, do not change the law. But more important: Walter's and Eastland's expressed views probably reveal less about their real feelings than about the political fencing that is now going on between the White House and Capitol Hill. Both men are dedicated champions of the present immigration Act, both are anxious to forestall any revision of it that would result in permanent quota changes. Any admission on their part that the Act is inadequate to deal with the Hungarian emergency would only buttress current Administration arguments in favor of overhauling the Act. In short, it would seem that Walter, Eastland and others in Congress would rather hold on to what control over the situation the parole section gives them (Congress can always halt the influx of refugees by declaring its unwillingness to grant permanent status to additional parolees) than invite an all-out attack on the present system.

Finally, an aspect of the refugee problem that one does not hear nearly enough about on Capitol Hill or anywhere else: What part can U. S. immigration policy play in the prosecution of the Third World War? The Chicago *Tribune* reports evidence that the Russians encouraged anti-Communist elements to flee Hungary in order to be rid of them. Administration leaders who favor a disengagement policy *vis à vis* the Soviet Union are not particularly disturbed by that possibility; indeed, a policy of luring anti-Soviet trouble makers out of the satellite zone would seem to implement present Administration strategy. By the same token, however, liberationists ought to have some misgivings about transplanting the European Resistance to the United States. Mr. John O'Donnell of the New York *Daily News* has a suggestion: Why shouldn't the U. S. take on its share of women, children and the aged who escape from behind the Iron Curtain, but provide that the able-bodied young men be organized into military units that can be sent into Eastern Europe in the event of a new satellite uprising?

Atoms for Peace—or War?

Would you vote to send atomic material to Russia or the satellite nations, or to give our atomic information and materials to an International Agency in which we do not have a decisive voice?

DAVID SHEA TEEPLE

Q. What is the International Atomic Energy Agency?
A. It is an agency designed to direct atomic energy to the cause of peace, health and prosperity throughout the world. The Agency is independent of the United Nations but is designed to cooperate with UN on matters of mutual interest.

Q. How is this Agency organized?
A. There is to be a General Conference consisting of all member states, each with one vote. It will meet once a year to consider policy questions. Detailed administration will be provided by a Board of Governors, consisting of at least twenty-one member states, each with one vote. Specific administration will be discharged by a Director General appointed by the Board of Governors (with the approval of the General Conference) for a term of four years. The Director General appoints, organizes and supervises the staff.

Q. What nations can belong to the Agency?
A. Any nation that belongs to the UN (or a specialized agency thereof) and ratifies the treaty. Nations not now members of the United Nations can become members by signing the treaty and being approved by a majority of the General Conference, upon recommendation by the Board of Governors.

Q. Might Red China be a member of the Agency?
A. There is no reason why not. The only thing necessary is a majority vote by the Board of Governors and the General Conference. There is no veto power.

Q. What is the Agency empowered to do?
A. The Agency is to act as broker and clearing house for atomic information, facilities, plants, materials and equipment. The Agency can also acquire materials and acquire and build plants, facilities, laboratories and equipment.

Q. Why is the Agency needed?
A. Presumably so that any atomic have-not nation may acquire atomic information, atomic materials, facilities, plants and equipment without having to negotiate directly with have-nations.

Q. What is the U.S. expected to contribute to the Agency?
A. 1) Information, 2) scientific and technical personnel, 3) fissionable material, and 4) money.

1. *Information*: Already the Atomic Energy Commission is using the agency as an excuse for declassifying information of considerable sensitivity. The danger of surrendering atomic information lies in the fact that there is no clear dividing line between information for peaceful uses and information for the making of weapons.

For example, considerable information dealing with plutonium is now classified because of its military implications. Yet it would be impossible to operate a power reactor which produces plutonium unless this information were available.

Dr. Donald J. Hughes, Senior Physicist at Brookhaven National Laboratory, stated before a congressional committee on March 8, 1956, "You cannot distinguish military from peacetime considerations when it is a matter of a high-powered reactor producing plutonium."

Once we make the information available to the Agency, it can be distributed as the Agency sees fit to all members.

2. *Scientific and Technical Personnel*: It is not clear how, given the shortage of scientific and technical personnel in the U.S., we are to furnish such personnel for the International Atomic Energy Agency.

3. *Fissionable Material*: On February 22, 1956, the President announced that 20,000 kilograms (44,000 pounds) of Uranium-235 would be allocated for use abroad. On October 23, 1956, a telegram from the President was read to the National Conference drafting the Agency's statute which said "The United States will make available to the International Agency, on terms to be agreed with the Agency, 5,000 kilograms of the nuclear fuel, Uranium-235, from the 20,000 kilograms of such material allocated last February by the U.S. for peaceful uses by friendly nations."

The President further stated that "In addition to the initial 5,000 kilograms of Uranium-235, the U.S. will continue to make available to the International Atomic Energy Agency nuclear materials that will match in amount the sum of all quantities of such materials made similarly available by all other members of the international agency, and on comparable terms, for the period between the establishment of the Agency and July 1, 1960."

David Shea Teeple has served as Military Intelligence Officer on the Manhattan (A Bomb) Project, Deputy Director of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, Special Assistant for Atomic Energy to the Inspector General of the Air Force and Assistant to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. He is now a consultant on atomic energy to both government and private industry.—THE EDITORS

We are further informed that the uranium to be furnished will be enriched 20 per cent in the isotope 235 and will probably be furnished in the form of uranium hexafloride. Twenty per cent enriched U-235 is extremely valuable and readily convertible into weapons material, as explained later.

4. *Money*: The cost of the Agency (as yet undetermined) will be assessed according as member nations currently support the UN. Under this arrangement the U.S. will pay one-third of the cost, whatever it may be.

Q. *How much are 20,000 kilograms of Uranium-235 worth?*
A. The price of Uranium-235 is set by the Atomic Energy Commission. The Commission values twenty thousand kilograms of U-235 at $500 million, or over 13 per cent of our capital investment over the years in atomic energy facilities and equipment.

Q. *Can this Agency prevent materials from being diverted for military purposes?*
A. Most American scientists have agreed that any large atomic power plant can create material latently useful for the production of atomic weapons. The 5,000 kg. which the United States is to contribute could quickly be brought from 20 per cent enrichment to enrichment sufficient for weapons. Moreover, the AEC has shown that 94 per cent of the cost of enriching uranium from normal to 90 per cent has been paid when the material is 20 per cent enriched.

Q. *What have American scientists said about the export of fissionable material?*
A. Some years ago Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer said: "There are no ingenious devices whereby one nation could detect or control atomic armament in another nation committed to sovereignty and secrecy in this field. If you hired me to walk through the cellars of Washington to see whether there were atomic bombs, I think my most important tool would be a screwdriver to open the crates and look. I think that just walking by, swinging a little gadget, would not give me the information. . . ."

"The manufacture of atomic energy for peace, in any plants that I have heard discussed, would make material latently which could be used for war. . . . If you did this, if you made atomic energy and sold it in kilowatts and so on and definitely made no provision for military inspection of the production which you were making at the same time and did this on a large scale, you would have perhaps solved, let us say, more than 60 per cent and less than 90 per cent of the problem of making atomic weapons."

Dr. Leo Szilard endorsed Senator Tydings' summation of his position, as follows:

"SENATOR TYDINGS: Therefore, I take it that your answer meant that unless there was an international climate created which would make the control of the bomb or the elimination of the bomb, whichever it might be, reasonably feasible with a promise of safety that, as an alternative, it would be better if we could have an agreement that nobody would manufacture atomic energy even for peacetime purposes, because it would be so easy to slip over into the field of war purposes. Am I correct in what I have said?

"DR. SZILARD. Yes; precisely."

Q. *Assuming that the signatory powers actually admitted inspectors to view the various projects, would such inspection be a reliable safeguard against the diversion of materials to military projects?*
A. The only reliable form of inspection would be a continuous inspection, of the kind that would be tantamount to superintending of operations 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

Q. *Does this Agency have enforcement machinery to punish violators and recover materials or equipment?*
A. No. The only thing the Agency can do to a violator is to refuse to give any more assistance and to report the matter to the United Nations. A member can be suspended by a two-thirds vote of the Conference upon the recommendation of the Board of Governors. The Agency could do nothing effective if a member expelled the inspectors and seized the materials stored or being used in the country.

Q. *Is the U.S. committed to the Agency?*
A. The President has stated that "It will be our policy . . . to seek to conduct our operations in support of nuclear power development abroad in consonance with the policy of the International Atomic Energy Agency, in whose endeavors we shall take our full part" (November 18, 1956). The United States Senate must ratify the agreement.

Q. *Would the distribution of U-235 throughout the world constitute a military hazard?*
A. Definitely. Present restrictions prevent a discussion of the number of A-bombs that could be made from 5,000 kg. of 20 per cent enriched 235, but the number is substantial.

Q. *Is Uranium-235 in short supply in the United States?*
A. One would assume so given the high support price of uranium. Twenty thousand kg. (44,000 pounds) of 20 per cent U-235 represents hundreds of thousands of tons of natural uranium ore.

Q. *Is there now in existence any workable plan to extend the peacetime uses of atomic energy in a scientific and orderly manner?*
A. Yes. The U.S. has entered into 37 bilateral agreements with various countries covering both research and the construction of power reactors, and will consider agreements with other countries prepared to meet the prerequisites we have established for mutual self-protection. The 20th semi-annual (July 1956) report of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission devotes five full pages to lauding our progress in this area.

Q. *Is American participation essential to the establishment of the Agency?*
A. No. Article XXI E states that the Agency does not go into effect until at least three of the following states—Canada, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America shall have ratified the statute. But without U.S. participation it would be pretty much a paper organization, for it is not expected that it will acquire substantial atomic assets from any other nation.

Q. *Has any prominent American opposed our membership?*
A. Not yet.

Q. *If the international distribution of atomic energy has the effect of industrializing underdeveloped nations, have we assured world peace?*
A. No one has ever been able to show a correlation between the industrial capacity of a country as measured by kilowatts and the pacifism of the nation. Actually if there is any correlation it appears to be in the reverse. Seldom do agricultural nations disturb the peace.

Q. *Will the program in fact assist the "underdeveloped areas" of the world?*
A. This is very doubtful. There is no such thing as a safe economic atomic power reactor built as yet. Until one is developed, it is unlikely that any country will receive benefits from atomic power.

The greatest chance for such development is in the U.S. If we transfer the responsibility to an international organization it will undoubtedly retard our own program since we are abundantly supplied with fossil fuels. If American business is deprived of a foreign market there will be less incentive for our industry to proceed.

Q. *Are we expected to believe that the President, Chairman Strauss of the AEC, the State Department and others are sponsoring our membership in an organization which is contrary to our national interests?*
A. This is a fair question and impossible to answer.

Q. *The purpose of the Agency, then, seems to be to relieve individual nations of the necessity of individually negotiating agreements with other nations concerning atomic energy. If that principle is sound, why shouldn't international agencies be formed to handle the distribution of other commodities, e.g., steel, fuel, feed and fibre, which are now subject to negotiation between nations?*
A. There is no reason at all.

Q. *Will the provisions of this agreement be kept by the signatory nations?*
A. This can only be answered with a question, namely: Do you know of any other international agreement that has not been violated within five, ten or twenty-five years?

For Better, for Worse, till Death Do Us Part

Q. *Do you think the American people would approve of U-235 which is an "A bomb" material being* GIVEN, SOLD *or* LEASED *by the U.S. to the international agency and subsequently being sent by the international agency to Czechoslavakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Poland, the Soviet Union or Red China?*
A. The question is rhetorical.

Q. *Could such a thing happen under this agreement?*
A. Positively—without a doubt. Once we make the material "available" to the Agency we have no further control over it. Control is vested in the Agency.

Article IX D states "On the request of the Agency a member shall, from the materials which it has made available, without delay deliver to another member or group of members such quantities of such materials as the Agency may specify. . . ." Ridiculous as it may seem, we could be required under this agreement to *deliver* the material directly to such nations as those mentioned above.

Furthermore Article IX J states: "The materials made available pursuant to this article shall be used as determined by the Board of Governors in accordance with the provisions of this statute. *No member shall have the right to require that the materials it makes available to the Agency be kept separately by the Agency or to designate the specific project in which they must be used.*"

Q. *What is the basic fault with the International Atomic Energy Agency?*
A. It is too big a step to be taken at this time. The proposed Agency has no substance, no continuity and no responsibility. It has absolutely no effective enforcement powers to carry out many of the functions of its own charter. Yet it could eventually acquire quantities of fissionable material which would constitute a grave threat to world peace.

Q. *What can I as an American citizen do about the International Atomic Energy Agency?*
A. If the questions and answers you have just read cause you any concern, you should exercise your right of petition by contacting your Congressmen, Senators and civic leaders. Ask them the questions which you have just read and do not stop until you get satisfactory answers.

And remember, the treaty comes before the Senate of the United States for ratification this month.

Letter from the Continent

E. v. KUEHNELT-LEDDIHN

Various Coalitions

There has been a minor internal crisis in Austria. There was actually a chance that the "black-red" coalition might be terminated and that the (Catholic) People's Party would enter into an alliance with the very small National-Liberal Freedom Party. Yet this development has been arrested, because the Socialists have shown a willingness to accede to one of the important demands of the People's Party, *i.e.*, to "de-nationalize" the big banks which in 1945 had become virtual state property.

The Austrian People's Party won the last election on a free-enterprise platform. But since the modern state tends to annex everything, right and left, some Austrians were sure that nothing but lip-service would be paid to the election program. To be quite frank, the Austrians have no exaggerated enthusiasm for a free market economy. They would, at any rate, not inquire about the source of high salaries. Rather, they would be satisfied to be subsidized by either the state or private enterprise. Socialism is a *fausse idée claire*: it easily takes a hold on naive minds. It needs some intelligence to understand the finer points of free enterprise.

But it is now evident that the People's Party had seriously intended to implement its election program. Yet whereas it is simple to "nationalize" private enterprise, it is much more difficult to unscramble the evil-tasting omelet. The only reasonable way out, in a small and not wealthy country like Austria, is to transform nationalized enterprises into corporations and to sell the shares to the public—which is precisely what the People's Party was ready to do. For this purpose, the People's Party needed the consent of its Socialist coalition partner, and this consent was procured only after protracted and painful negotiations. Now the road for the *Volksaktien* (small-denomination people's shares) is free and thus the public is given an opportunity to invest and even to speculate. This, for Central Europe, is something revolutionary. Yes, the old financial and economic habits are rapidly breaking down, and the Socialists realize that their chances, once capitalism becomes popularized and "democratized," will be increasingly dimmer. (Of course, they also have other headaches—as, for instance, new social forms like co-management, co-ownership, profit-sharing and partnership, which will render the Socialist-dominated trade-unions unimportant, if not superfluous.)

The Hungarian Revolution, now approaching its third month, is also having its effects on Austrian socialism. There are a few people here who remember indelicately the fact that the Russian Communists were originally the "majority" (*bolshevik*) wing of the Russian Social Democratic Party; and, for these people, everything smacking of Marx, dialectical materialism, state ownership of the means of production, anti-Christianism, is suspect, to say the least. There have lately been some local elections in Austria, and they resulted in the loss of as much as 60 per cent of the Communist vote (which won't necessarily mean that the same percentage has to be written off in France or Italy), but they also hit the Socialist Party.

For instance, the Socialist Party had been successful in making inroads into Carinthia's Peasant Chamber (which corresponds roughly to the Farm Bureau), but these gains were suddenly wiped out. Today, any party sporting Red as a symbolic color had better watch out in Austria.

Recent elections in Germany produced a somewhat different picture. There the Socialists won, even heavily, and more so than the Christian Democratic Union which also increased its hold on the electorate. The real losers were the National-Liberal parties like the F.D.P., led by Dr. Dehler. "National Liberalism" in Germany feeds on a hodgepodge of nationalism (which today means "reunification at any price"), "anti-clericalism" (directed against Protestants as well as Catholics), centralization and subtly camouflaged anti-Western sentiment. The more constructive elements in the F.D.P. pulled out some time ago, and today are once more collaborating with Dr. Adenauer. It is doubtful whether the F.D.P., which represents everything petty, provincial and irresponsible in German politics will ever rise again. The year 1957 will nevertheless bring tumultuous elections for Germany, and if old Adenauer turns over the reins it is questionable whether the heir-apparent, Karl Arnold, will be as magnetic a figurehead of the CDU as *der Alte*.

A literary-political surprise comes from France—M. Maurice Collinon's book on the relationship between the Catholic Church and Free Masonry, *L'Église en face de la Franc-Maçonnerie*.

In the lengthening shadows of Soviet imperialism ancient enmities have been minimized. As early as 1948 a variety of efforts were made to bridge the old antithesis between Rome and Masonry. In that year Geneva's Lodge "Alpina" debated a rapprochement with the Vatican, and the learned Jesuit, Father Berteloot, published two books on Free Masonry which were unusually friendly.

Though there were a few, rather insignificant, connections between Communism and Masonry in the early twenties, it soon became evident that the Kremlin and the Lodges had entirely different goals; and it was especially Yorkist Masonry which displayed open hostility towards Communism.

There have been more efforts to iron out all differences between the Church and the Masons, but they usually foundered on Masonry's deist tradition and partly on its character of a secret society with specific oaths of loyalty and allegiance. Still, the new book by Mr. Collinon, a Catholic, might foreshadow a *modus vivendi* (rather than an alliance) between these two great forces in Europe.

The Year in American Literature

Professor Clark of the University of Michigan is one of those rare teachers of English who respond with undiminished appetite to contemporary writing. Here he tells why

JOHN ABBOT CLARK

1956 was a year of many novels, a handful of short story collections, many sheaves of verse, a half-dozen autobiographies and volumes of letters, about the usual number of literary biographies, quite a few works of literary history, and not very many books of essays or literary criticism.

The outstanding literary events of the year were the death of H. L. Mencken, and the posthumous publication of his *Minority Report* and *A Carnival of Buncombe;* the 250th anniversary of Franklin's birth; the observance of the 100th anniversaries of the births of Shaw and Freud; the Bridey Murphy craze; the reunion in Nashville of that famous literary group of the twenties, The Fugitives, which included, among others, Donald Davidson, Allen Tate, John Crowe Ransom, and Robert Penn Warren; the critical to-do over Colin Wilson's *The Outsider;* Granville Hicks' attack in the *New Leader* on Anthony West and the *New Yorker's* book section, which was entertaining, though not very convincing or particularly damaging; the National Book Awards (John O'Hara's *Ten North Frederick* in fiction, W. H. Auden's *The Shield of Achilles* in poetry, and Herbert Kubly's *American in Italy* in nonfiction); Auden's election to the Professorship of Poetry at Oxford; the spate of Civil War and election-year books; the entry of more and more publishers into the "quality" paperback field; the Pulitzer Prizes (MacKinlay Kantor's *Andersonville* in fiction, and Elizabeth Bishop's *Poems: North and South* in poetry); T. S. Eliot's drawing an audience of around 14,000 for a lecture on literary criticism at the University of Minnesota (the paper was later printed in the *Sewanee Review*); and Robert E. Fitch's devastating dissection of the reigning literary cults of sex and obscenity in the *New Republic* (*"La Mystique de la Merde"*).

Novels

Beginning with fiction, it might be relevant to take a quick look at what some of the reviewers had to say about a few of the more "significant" novels of the year. *The Last Hurrah* probably had more readers and received more loud hurrahs from the critics than any other American novel. John V. Kelleher called it "the funniest American book in a decade . . . the first successful Irish-American novel." Clifton Fadiman declared it to be "one of the most delightful novels ever written about American politics." And Howard Mumford Jones commended it "to anybody who wants to read large, generous-minded fiction, and to anybody else who wants to know how American politics really operated in the generation of J-m-s M. C-rl-y. It's a perfectly swell job."

Mr. O'Connor's novel, which topped the best-seller lists throughout most of 1956, also came in for a few brickbats. "One can imagine," wrote Anthony West in the *New Yorker,* "a powerful and convincing novel written tough-mindedly around the idea that the old-time city boss was a rococo ornament to the political scene, and the source of a barrel of rough fun, but Mr. O'Connor's sentimental presentation of that barbarous figure as a fairy godmother of widows and orphans is more than hard to take. It persuasively pretends that mean vices are virtues, and it is that rare thing, a genuinely subversive book."

Caroline Gordon's *The Malefactors* was probably the finest novel of the year—in certain respects at least, if not in all. As Arthur Mizener so justly put the matter: "She is not simply a gifted novelist; she is one with the intelligence to discipline and cultivate her powers so that her books have grown more skillful with time and her perceptions have not dried up as gifted writers' perceptions so often have in our time." But, he went on to observe, "not many people seem to notice. The decades go on tossing up their temporary immortals to fill the journals with their reputations, and Miss Gordon goes on being unnoticed."

Reviewing the National Book Award winner in fiction, *Ten North Frederick,* in the *Commonweal,* John F. Sullivan said some things which one wishes more reviewers would say when reporting on books like Mr. O'Hara's: "We are hypocritical," Mr. Sullivan maintained, "to ban the import of books like *Lady Chatterley's Lover* or the works of Henry Miller, if this native product is entitled to unrestricted circulation. For it must be said at the outset that this is a rough book, full of four-letter words and clinically observed sex, and there is apt to be a furore about it which may have little to do with whatever artistic values are to be found in it."

Other novels of the year that came in for a great deal of attention were Elizabeth Spencer's *The Voice at the Back Door,* which Brendan Gill called "a practically perfect novel"; Irwin Shaw's *Lucy Crown,* which to most of the critics was quite disappointing; John Hersey's *A Single Pebble,* with its poetic mysticism frequently a bit on the cardboard side; Peter De Vries' unbrokenly bright and witty *Comfort Me with Apples,* which proved to one reviewer, at least, "that the tongue can finally wear a hole in the cheek"; Nelson Algren's *A Walk on the Wild Side,*

which many of the reviewers either rhapsodized over in rather lush fashion, *à la* Algren, or whiplashed in rather savage fashion, *à la* Algren; and William Brinkley's *Don't Go Near the Water,* which by popular acclaim, was the laugh hit of 1956, although a number of usually reliable reviewers found it almost maddeningly unfunny.

And there were still other novels published during the year that deserve mention: *The Rancho of the Little Loves,* by Robert Nathan; *The Dispossessed,* by Goeffrey Wagner; *The Great World and Timothy Colt,* by Louis Auchincloss; and *The Success,* by Helen Howe.

Short Stories

In the field of the short story, J. F. Powers' *The Presence of Grace* was the outstanding collection of the year. J. Donald Barr had the following astute comment on Mr. Powers' virtues as a storyteller: "Mr. Powers has a beautiful technique that never appears to be a technique. These stories are constructed with classical directness. Scenes are in sequence—each scene advancing the clarification of the theme—each scene with its own tension—every idea and question embodied in the flesh and bone of a scene. The dialogue is distinguished. Many writers have a good ear for the way people talk, but Mr. Powers has an ear for the way *persons* talk; he makes us hear the mentalities of his characters."

Another excellent volume of stories was Wallace Stegner"s *The City of the Living.* Also worthy of note were Saul Bellow's *Seize the Day,* Dorothy Canfield's *Harvest of Stories, The Best Short Stories of Theodore Dreiser,* and the O. Henry Award *Prize Stories 1956* (edited by Engle and Martin).

Judging by the number of volumes of new verse issued during the year, as well as by the increasing attention accorded them by the leading reviews and journals of opinion, poetry seemed to be flourishing for a change. But these encouraging signs to the contrary, I suspect that current interest in current poetry remains quite severely limited—for reasons I shall not attempt to go into here.

At any rate, attention should certainly be called to the following volumes: *The Talking Bronco,* by Roy Campbell; *Like a Bulwark,* by Marianne Moore; *American Twelfth Night,* by Sister M. Madeleva; *A Change of Sky,* by Helen Bevington; *Poems Old and New,* by John Hall Wheelock; *Things of This World,* by Richard Wilbur; *A Doctor's Book of Hours,* by Merrill Moore; *Section: Rock Drill . . .,* by Ezra Pound; *Storm at Castelfranco,* by Chester Kallman; *Book of Lyrics,* by Witter Bynner; *American Child* (with 36 new poems), by Paul Engle; *The Nets,* by Brewster Ghiselin; *The Unicorn,* by Anne Morrow Lindbergh; *Homage to Mistress Bradstreet,* by John Berryman; *And Pastures New,* by Melville Cane; and *Prefabrications,* by Josephine Miles.

Among the volumes listed above, Richard Wilbur's probably received the most serious (and appreciative) critical attention, John Hall Wheelock's was undoubtedly the most solidly and genuinely distinguished, Helen Bevington's the wittiest, Ezra Pound's the most conductive to critical Choctaw, Roy Campbell's the most vigorous and incisive, Paul Engle's the most ingratiating, Peter Viereck's (as usual) the most brilliant, and Mrs. Lindbergh's the most appealing to the general reader. And to many of these same general readers, the most gratifying poetic event of 1956 was the publication of Edna St. Vincent Millay's *Collected Poems.*

Biographies

Of literary biographies appearing during the year, Donald Elder's *Ring Lardner* was one of, if not the, best. Considered as a critique, for all its intelligence and perceptiveness, it leaves much to be desired; but as a life, it comes pretty close to being definitive. And perhaps it might be pertinent to observe that while reading Mr. Elder's book, as well as many of the reviews of it, one all too easily tended to forget what Lardner actually did by reason of having one's attention repeatedly called to what he might have done.

Perhaps the most poignantly revealing biography of the year was one of Sinclair Lewis by his first wife, Grace Hegger Lewis, *With Love from Gracie*—a much better book, as a number of reviewers pointed out, than its title might lead one to think. Other biographical items were *Helen Keller,* by Van Wyck Brooks; *Booth Tarkington,* by James Woodress; *The Road to Realism* (W. D. Howells), by Edwin H. Cady; *Thoreau of Walden,* by Henry Beetle Hough; *The Cup of Fury* (touching, often harrowing, accounts of writers like London, Dreiser, Sherwood Anderson, F. Scott Fitzgerald, *et al.,* and their battles—mostly losing—with the demon rum), by that teetotaler's teetotaler, Upton Sinclair; and *H. L. Mencken: A Portrait from Memory,* by Charles Angoff—a book which, as far as I am concerned, might better have gone unwritten, to put it, as far as I am concerned, most, most charitably.

Some interesting and useful volumes of literary history to come out in 1956 were *The American Lyceum,* by Carl Bode; *The Jazz Age Revisited,* British Criticism of American Civilization during the 1920's, by George Harmon Knoles; *The Raven and the Whale,* by Perry Miller; *The Contemporary American Novel in France,* by Thelma M. Smith and Ward L. Miner; *The Crucial Decade* (1945-1954), by Walter B. Rideout; *All the Happy Endings* (the domestic novel by women writers in the last half of the nineteenth century), by Helen Waite Papashvily; *The Fiction Factory* (the 100-year story of Street and Smith, from Nick Carter to *Mademoiselle*), by Quentin Reynolds; and *The Negro in American Culture,* by Margaret Just Butcher.

Of autobiographies and letters, the following deserve to be singled out: *Henry James: Autobiography,* edited by F. W. Dupee; *The Selected Letters of Henry James,* edited by Leon Edel; *The Letters of Thomas Wolfe,* edited by Elizabeth Nowell; *I Wonder as I Wander,* by Langston Hughes; *Home to Texas* (what a relief and what a pleasure—after James and Wolfe), by Stanley Walker; *The Five-Dollar Gold Piece,* by Orville Prescott; and *Blessed Are the Debonair,* by Margaret Case Harriman.

Other highly worthwhile books of an autobiographical nature, or containing autobiographical material, were James Baldwin's *Notes of a Native Son;* Harvey Breit's collection of interviews with contemporary authors, *The Writer Observed;* Willa Cather's *W. C. in Europe,* edited by George N. Kates (welcome as these travel articles are, it is very doubtful

(*Continued on p. 47*)

THE IVORY TOWER

WM. F. BUCKLEY, JR.

The Financial Predicament of Higher Education—Or A-Whoring We Will Go (I)

Administrators of private colleges throughout the land have spent, are spending, and are due to spend many waking hours and many sleepless nights worrying about financing their schools. It is good that they should worry a little bit—it is good for the schools and it is good for their souls—but they are made to worry too much. Serenity seems always outside their reach, and their concern—and their lives—have become hectic. They suffer, and education suffers. And teachers, the principal victims, are made to get along with ignominious stipends. The situation does not improve.

Take Yale. A few weeks ago, President Whitney Griswold announced—calmly—that we are in "one of the worst crises in the history of American education." No one paid much attention to him because yesterday's Worst Crisis is fresh in everyone's mind, and most of us are willing to give odds that when the annual reports come in from the other college presidents, tomorrow, next year, a decade hence, we will find ourselves in yet-the-worst crisis. Mr. Griswold recognizes the jaded bloom of the emergency appeal, so he comes right out and says it: things aren't going to get better—by definition. Higher education needs more and more and more. Before anybody else had a chance to think of it, he himself recalled that in 1950 Yale had appealed for an additional $80 million and that by the end of 1956 it had got $78 million. With the result that Yale is provided for in her old age? Heavens no: with the result that Yale is entered on "one of the worst crises" in her history.

"Education is"—Mr. Griswold asks us to face the fact—"a charity. Because it cannot, by its nature,make a profit, its existence depends upon what society is willing to contribute to it." He quoted from a report to the alumni issued in 1891: "There are perhaps some who object that Yale always wants funds. But is not this the proof of her progress and life? When she ceases to have wants . . . she will no longer be worthy of her past history or of our present devotion." You can say *that* again, says Mr. Griswold (again and again), as he proceeds to survey the pressing needs of his university, and to urge his alumni to give more, not just this year and next, but every year.

Accepting the fact, then, that financing higher education is a continuing problem, college administrators have been turning their fertile imaginations to potential sources of regular support. For various reasons —political infeasibility, traditional objections, fear of control—they do not turn to the government, state or federal, for general operating expenses.

The government is ruled out, then. So, with Willie Sutton's unerring sense for going where the money is, university administrators have swooped down on the corporation. The rationale is easy beyond words. Simply remind corporations that colleges are training young men in the skills that industry goes on to utilize: hence industry should help shoulder the cost of that training. In 1952, a Commission on Financing Higher Education was established, for the purpose of persuading corporations to make grants to the colleges. The operation has met with considerable success. Several years ago in New Jersey legal challenge was met and overcome. A few benighted stockholders wanted to know just where their corporation (the A. P. Smith Co.) got off making a gift of stockholders' money to Princeton University. A court ruled the gift legal—though on grounds highly embarrassing to universities, for the judge in question legitimized the gift on the assumption that "Princeton emphasizes by precept and indoctrination the principles which are very vital to the preservation of our own democratic system of business and government." It being a clear violation of academic freedom for a college to emphasize *anything* by precept or indoctrination, the language of the decision is avoided like litany from a Black Mass. Just the same, the university world has managed to parlay that decision into a legal carte blanche for corporations to give large sums of money to colleges and universities.

Other problems than what does the stockholder get out of it have arisen, of course, but they have been seen and conquered, with suavity and dispatch, by the college administrators. Last spring the presidents of Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Princeton, Stanford and Yale promulgated a set of "Guiding Principles for Industrial Gifts." The Preamble to the Guiding Principles begins by remarking such things as that "colleges and universities have a deep obligation to society," and then hurries on to discuss "the form of corporate giving most useful to the college or university" (cash). Delicately, the presidents warn colleges and universities against permitting "their names to be used in any related advertising" of their corporation donors, but hasten to grant that "Corporations obviously deserve the goodwill that is the natural and appropriate dividend of genuine philanthropy." (The distinction for which they grope is not altogether clear. Presumably it would be all right to establish a Colgate Chair of Political Economy, but not a Colgate "It Cleans Your Breath While It Cleans Your Teeth" Chair of anything. Accordingly, such things as the plain and simple Socony Mobil Professorship of Nuclear Engineering (Princeton) are cropping up all over the place.)

Finally, the Guiding Principles come through with a most endearing —and, in formulation, infinitely more guarded than Charlie Wilson's—affirmation of a community of interests: ". . . the university can truthfully say that the strength of the American corporation and its own are interdependent." With that coquetry there is nothing left for the college president to do save inform the corporation president that he just *happens* to have a blank check in case he didn't bring his own . . .

(To be continued)

Principles and Heresies

FRANK S. MEYER

Notes on the Papal Message

We have long since become accustomed to hearing the West, when problems of human action are in question, speak either in instrumental and "scientific" terms or, alternately, with empty sentimentality; while it is left to the Communists to guide themselves by firm principle (evil though that principle be). So much the more exhilarating, then, is it to hear a forceful voice call us back to our heritage of principle—and not in vague, general terms, but in direct analysis of the intellectual and spiritual crisis in which we are bogged down.

Such was the voice of Pope Pius XII in his message broadcast to the world this Christmas. He spoke first to his own Church; but those who do not in all things share his faith nor accept his spiritual authority can find in his words a fundamental wisdom of which we have urgent need.

I stress the fundamental wisdom, for there is (as always when prudential considerations are at stake) much room for argument as to certain of his detailed estimations of forces and institutions. I, for one, would strongly question the potentiality of the United Nations as a force for peace and freedom, or—granted the possibility—even the advisability of the creation of a political organization to which centralized power would be attributed in any serious degree. For once power is established in a centralized institution, it tends rapidly to accrete more and more power to itself; and if the national Leviathan state beats us with rods, the international Leviathan will beat us with scorpions.

But this is, as I have said, a matter of a prudential estimation—one arrived at upon considerations far removed from the usual UN sentimentality and one which must be considered in relation to other prudential conclusions in this message, such as the forthright assertion of the morality of a just war. It is on another level than the prudential that this Christmas message contains its uniquely valuable, its inherently necessary, call to the enfeebled conscience and understanding of the West.

To begin with, its value rests in the insistence that the prudential sphere itself is secondary to, dependent upon, a higher realm of eternal value; and that the effort so prevalent today to ignore that realm and to decide the practical purely in terms of the practical leads inevitably to the bewilderment in the face of apparently insoluble problems, the erratic movement between overweening pride in the power of man's science and paralyzing terror of it, that characterizes our era.

"It is beyond doubt," to quote the Pope's words (in the rather lamentable English of the truncated translation in the *New York Times*),

> that the weight of a flagrant contradiction presses down the human race in the twentieth century, as if striking it in its pride: On the one hand, there is the confident expectation of modern man, fashioner and eyewitness of the "second technical revolution," . . . On the other hand, there is the bitter reality of the long years of grief and ruin, with [their] resulting fear. . . . Something, then, is not proceeding aright in the internal scheme of modern life; an essential error must be sapping its foundation.

The primal source of that error he sees, if I understand him, in the imbalance between the natural and the divine in the modern world-view. Reducing everything to the level of the naturally and immediately perceptible, man has come inevitably to this fatal alternation of vaunting optimism and despairing pessimism as the result of his efforts to solve with unaided finite powers problems beyond the reach of the finite.

The contradiction between seeming power and ultimate helplessness is as old as the Tower of Babel and as contemporary as the hydrogen bomb. It is always the result of a mood which a leading secularist philosopher in a moment of humility once called "cosmic impiety." Perhaps never have men striven so savagely as today to preserve that mood, to drive the contradiction from their minds. Every intellectual and practical resource is devoted to the effort to destroy utterly one of its poles, to dissolve value into convenience and principle into instrumentality. Our present confusion and dismay are in direct proportion to the magnitude of that effort. Here is the harvest of the endeavors of the social engineers, of the analytical philosophers who would deprive thought of its substance, of the plastic surgeons of the psyche who labor at remaking the image of man. It is such as these who, to quote again the words of the papal message,

> exasperated by the contradiction but reluctant to surrender the dream of the omnipotence of man, wish to submit to revision those values also over which they have no power and which elude the control of man's free choice, such as religion and natural rights.

The Recovery of Freedom

It is a hard message for our generation, raised in the glorification of man between the afterglow of nineteenth-century scientific optimism and its ominous consummation in the fireball of Hiroshima. It calls upon us to give up both the modes of our set emotional physiognomy, "not to look on human nature with a systematic pessimism or with a gratuitous optimism, but rather to recognize the real dimensions of [man's] power." But it has its rewards. In a world where the very possibility of freedom seems about to be ground out of existence between the upper millstone of the total state and the lower millstone of behavioral science and mass communications, it points the way to the recovery of freedom.

Karl Marx proclaimed: "Philosophers have previously thought about the world, it is up to us to change it"; and that proclamation has become the leading idea of all the schools of thought which have made our world. It sounded once like a clarion call to freedom, but its fruits have been anything but freedom. And still we cling to its essence, the idea that man can make himself. Pius XII calls on us to reject that error, to build on "the historic reality of man," and to find our freedom in the understanding of our created character, not in dreams of planned Utopias.

ARTS and MANNERS

WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

"Baby Doll" and Infant Minds

Whether *Baby Doll* is as filthy a picture as Cardinal Spellman told his flock it was, I do not know. I haven't seen it yet. But I have seen, in print, what our certified intellectuals had to say on the subject. It was far more revolting than the movie could possibly be.

Messrs. Tennessee Williams and Elia Kazan, this time, did not even invoke their poetical license. Nor did they claim that the Cardinal misinterpreted *Baby Doll's* message. All they said, in a disturbingly asinine way, was (you won't believe it!) that they intended to arouse the nation against people who keep retarded girls in unconsummated wedlock. I am no particular expert on the mating habits of Southern illiterates. But I think I shall not be contradicted if I contend that people who crave retarded girls in unconsummated wedlock are one of the less important pressure groups in this country.

On the whole it is rather safe to assume that there are about fifteen times as many lobbies who sell, say, homosexuality to this nation than there are lobbies in support of imbecilic perverts who go (though not the whole hog) for retarded girls. And yet, Mr. Tennessee Williams would surely be among the very first to protest against a movie that tried to arouse the nation against intelligent homosexuals. Why, then, should he want to arouse the nation against a moronic and relatively rare perversion of white trash?

To this, the answer is that Mr. Williams did no such thing. All he and Mr. Kazan had in mind, let's face it, was to make easy money with a dirty joke. And I, for one, am tired of the dry rot that immediately starts spreading through the nation's press whenever somebody happens to dislike one shoddy business practice or the other of our literary tradespeople.

The official cant has it that every miserable little scriptwriter, just because he uses a typewriter instead of a sewing machine, is touched by the spirit, and must not be talked to irreverently; while any mere merchant may be assumed guilty until proved innocent. The certified intellectuals who at once came to the noisy rescue of Messrs. Williams and Kazan are habitually among the most vociferous public opponents of TV commercials. Now most TV commercials *are* despicable; but they are also, bit for bit, just as much a studious "intellectual" effort of overpaid scribes as the average movie script. And if the Voltaires of the *New York Post* consider it proper to give merciless battle to wretched cosmetic advertisers, why do their editorial pages burn with fury over people who oppose the B.O. bottled for the general public by Messrs. Williams and Kazan?

Because, if the *New York Post* calls for a boycott of a transcendent artist like Gieseking (who kept playing his piano under the Nazis), it puts humanity above arty art; but if Cardinal Spellman enjoins his faithful against bundling with Messrs. Williams and Kazan, he is superimposing censorship on the Constitution which, as everybody knows, has no higher purpose than the protection of "Baby Dolls" and Infant Voltaires.

The scandal grows truly hilarious if one compares the contractual situation of Cardinal Spellman with that of Mr. James Wechsler. The Cardinal has an airtight contract with his constituency to pass judgment on such moral issues as may be involved even in the writings of Mr. Tennessee Williams. And his constituency is firmly banded together by nothing but its members' own free will to belong and to submit. So that the Cardinal exercises the constituency's unquestionable rights and his own duties whenever he condemns—and the condemnation is binding for no one but him who voluntarily considers himself bound by it—a lascivious opus.

And now, in contrast, what is Mr. Wechsler's situation? He has a contract with no one but Mrs. Dorothy Schiff, the *New York Post's* gracious publisher. His constituency includes me who, though I buy the paper practically every day for the tonic effect it has on a sluggish circulation, have ceded to Mr. Wechsler none of my own responsibilities, particularly not my judgment of Gieseking's integrity. If and when Mr. Wechsler implores me not to patronize a Gieseking recital, all that happens is that an employee of Mrs. Schiff's makes a public nuisance of himself. Unlike Cardinal Spellman, Mr. Wechsler does not speak even for himself. Nobody, most certainly not I, a regular buyer of the *New York Post*, has entrusted him with the kind of public function which several million Catholics have granted the Cardinal. So that each time Mr. Wechsler initiates a boycott he stages an illegitimate farce of the act Cardinal Spellman organizes with an unchallengeable authority.

All this, I repeat, has nothing to do with censorship. Also, it has nothing to do with the alleged artistic merits of *Baby Doll*. I can assure those of my readers who have no experience with that kind of thing that there exist, in fact, pornographic works of charm, literacy and artistic beauty. But there is one aspect of them which no one in his right mind would dispute: they all *are* pornographic. And the freedom that the foes of censorship invoke most certainly includes the freedom, for those who are spiritually prejudiced against pornography, to have pornographic objects *identified* as such.

Cardinal Spellman has so identified *Baby Doll;* and as one who has seen, some seasons ago, the playlet from which Mr. Williams borrowed the plot for the movie, I am nonplussed by the Liberal uproar. If that plot is not pornographic, then Mr. Wechsler is a wit. Cardinal Spellman has implored those who of their own free will are under his spiritual discipline, to avoid the kind of goosing Messrs. Williams and Kazan are ready to supply for a consideration. If this is not Cardinal Spellman's right and duty, then Mr. Wechsler is a trustee of the general welfare. And Cardinal Spellman, I might add, did not try to sell himself as a movie critic. If only Mr. Wechsler had this kind of innate modesty and didn't offer himself as a spiritual leader!

BOOKS IN REVIEW

A Seasonal Tonic

ROBERT PHELPS

It has been published in the United States for 165 successive years, and for the price of a package of cigarettes you will probably be able to pick up a copy in almost any drugstore or bus depot that has a magazine rack. Though the full title remains as obstinately pendulous with subtitles as a Defoe novel, you will only have to ask for *The Old Farmer's Almanac* (by Robert B. Thomas, 112 pp. Dublin, N. H.: Yankee, Inc., 25¢) to get the real, right thing. Accept no substitutes, especially none of the widely publicized handbooks of useful facts which *call* themselves almanacs. These are handy, and not to be denigrated, but the little book I am talking about is in another class. Taken in short, daily doses over the coming year, it will have an effect on your imagination, your liver, your survival glands, which you will not be ungrateful for.

I am not, let me specify at once, recommending its *charm*, or its appeal as a piece of picturesque Yankee Americana. Nor am I hoping to expose its pages to that curious, revivalistic taste which has recently sprung up in reaction to Prog-Culch, and perversely endorses whatever is UN-streamlined, from the staunch sturdiness of Jack Daniels whiskey bottles to automobile headlamps which have not been swallowed by fenders. I sympathize, guardedly, with this well-meaning if slightly monstrous trend (largely because I keep turning up its unhealthy instincts in myself), but on the other hand, I am not anxious to see a copy of this perfectly serious, unexhibitionistic book in the hands of a man who, while he lounges in a steel and canvas chair, listening to his hi-fi unit precisely recreate the tinny timbre of a barrel-house piano, will exclaim patronizingly over its homely, "old-fashioned" ads for eczema curatives, abdominal trusses, and imitation diamond rings, and maybe even—as a recent house guest of mine suggested—have them photostatically enlarged and framed for the rumpus room.

No. At whatever risk may be involved, I want to speak for the daily delight that can come from taking these densely printed pages on their own terms.

An almanac, says my dictionary, is a register of the days of the year, with astronomical data, and civil and ecclesiastical events. Now of course, any such chronology of events presupposes a community, a closed, integrated membership, temporal as well as spiritual, within which the events have meaning. Anyone who is a member of the Catholic community lives through an organically significant year of festivals. And, in their way, both TV and Soviet Communism maintain pseudo-communities,[1] in which the night of the $64,000 question, or May Day, are festival occasions.

But for anyone who may belong to neither a true nor a pseudo-community the wish for a chronology of significant events is as persistent as it is involuntary. "What," he asks himself, "can I look at, out there in the world of things and happenings, with honest reverence and delight?" If he glances at any of his civil leaders, or national holidays, he will feel silly. How can he respect anything so perfunctory as a Presidential address, or as corrupt as National Doughnut Week? What, then, is left?

Poets have always known. The two safest, least anachronistic outside phenomena a poem can refer to are the seasons, and the stars. These do not date. They are arranged, but not by an ad-man. "The moon has set, and the Pleiades," sang Sappho; and our own Hemingway, so unjustly reduced by two generations of readers to a mere spokesman for "the lost generation," was moved by the same perennial order when the title of his novel about desolate humans reminded us that "the sun also rises."

What *The Old Farmer's Almanac* can do for anyone who will read it without preciosity or condescension, is remind him that, *faute de mieux*, he can always become a watching member of the pre-human community of the seasons and the stars; moreover, teach him, with tables, symbols, and some of the most enchanting shoptalk I have ever known, how to follow the festivals our own very orderly planet observes throughout the year. It is thanks to *OFA*, for instance, that I know the crescent of pale silver in this morning's sky was the final quarter of the "Cold Moon," which "southed" at 7:15 a.m., conjunct with Saturn and Neptune in the house of Scorpio; while the sun, less than a week after the solstice, was coming north again, and stood a little more than twenty-three degrees below the celestial equator, in the house of Capricorn. Nor do I have to be privy to the arcana of either astrology or astronomy to be exhilarated by this knowledge. Simply to know, to be a squinting, amateur witness to so much precision and progression, is delightful. The imagination quickens; the spirits tingle; the mind wonders. I cannot remember ever feeling this way when, say, I watched our President on TV, or a Fourth of July traffic jam, or the faces of Christmas shoppers.

[1] A pseudo-community is one which amasses identity without preserving it. A true community not only unites its members, but distinguishes them. It contains, without de-facing.

Free of Twaddle

A Ride to Panmunjom, by Duane Thorin. 303 pp. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company. $4.00

During the war in which the United States destroyed its prestige in the Orient Mr. Thorin was taken prisoner by the North Koreans. His "novel" is a study of a group of American prisoners and their reactions to the privations and abuse to which they were subjected by their captors. Since his perception of human character has not been distorted by psychological twaddle, he understands and makes clear why each of these men either broke under pressure or had the strength to remain loyal to himself and his comrades.

Among the traitors there is one figure who should particularly arrest the reader's attention because he represents an "element of modern American society" that we are often afraid to contemplate. He is the normal, the inevitable product of the Welfare State (currently called "modern Republicanism"). He cheerfully cooperated with his captors and betrayed his comrades because "the nature of his upbringing had taught him to cater to whatever hand ladled out the welfare."

Even more instructive, perhaps, is Mr. Thorin's report on the Korean and Chinese Communists. The lower ranks were composed of ignorant and stupid creatures who believed in egalitarianism, but above them were the "interrogators," intelligent and educated men. They were not primarily interested in obtaining false "confessions" of "war crimes," but rather in forcing on their victims the intellectual and moral degradation in which the distinction between truth and falsehood becomes meaningless. They sought to bring their prisoners to equality with themselves on the level of pure pragmatism.

Mr. Thorin's observations confirm Czeslaw Milosz' *The Captive Mind* and complement Gerhart Niemeyer's *Inquiry into Soviet Mentality.* The people whom he saw in control were not dupes of the creed they professed. "Intellects that failed to see through the falsities of Communism were so arrested that they were of only limited use in the totalitarian state."

The point is worth noting—particularly if you have been in the habit of assuming that the American "intellectuals" who scream for more and more socialism are merely sentimental boobs who repeat the nonsense they learned from "progressive educators." Some of them may be more intelligent than you think.

REVILO OLIVER

In Defense of the System

Democracy and the American Party System, by Austin Ranney and Willmoore Kendall. 550 pp. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. $7.75

This book, though designed for use as a college textbook on American party politics, has much to interest the general reader as well. Its coverage of the structure and activities of major and third parties is distinguished both by its tough-mindedness of inquiry and its avoidance of diffuse description for the sake of description.

Ranney and Kendall do not assume the first word in their title to be so well understood that its meaning may remain implicit, or be conveyed by platitudes. The first eighty pages expound the elements of a model of democracy, which are then used throughout the book to assess the merits and demerits of the parts and the sum of the American party system. This deliberate and open statement of standards, and repeated use of those standards for evaluating empirical findings, deserves wider adoption in the discipline of political science. Not the least of the virtues of such an approach is that the reader is able to say with some precision just where and how he disagrees with the interpretations offered.

Having adopted an "absolute" or "unlimited" majoritarian view of democracy, Ranney and Kendall emerge as ardent supporters both of the American party system, admittedly decentralized and localistic, and of the constitutional system, admittedly anti-majoritarian in motivation and in its institutional arrangements.

Ranney and Kendall seek to escape from the difficulties of their position in three ways. The first is to ground their most persuasive defense of the party system on another element of democracy which, in effect, injects moderation as a limitation on majorities, namely: "the provision that the members of the community must feel for one another at least that minimum of mutual need that makes for forebearance on the part of majorities and minorities alike." The authors quite rightly conclude that in the performance of this function of fostering consensus ". . . rests the party system's strongest claim to be regarded as a valuable agency for democratic government."

Their second tactic is an attempt to reinterpret the constitutional system as ultimately majoritarian, in the sense that "relatively persistent national popular majorities do have unlimited power under our present Constitution despite what the Framers intended." Here this reviewer cannot follow them. Our system fragments governmental power and so discourages the easy practice of majority rule. And to call it majoritarian, on the grounds that it does not present insurmountable barriers to cohesive majorities willing to overcome or destroy the barriers, is to impair the usefulness of the term for purposes of communication and analysis.

The third tactic is that of knocking the stuffing out of a straw man—by demonstrating that the American party system is superior to a partyless system in fulfilling the requirements of the democratic model. The current dispute over American party politics accepts the inevitability and desirability of parties in a democracy, for the most part grants the superiority of the two-party over the one—and multiple—party types, and takes as its battlefield the question what kind of two-party system best realizes democratic values. Ranney and Kendall do devote some attention to the latter topic. But their generally persuasive defense of the current party pattern would have been that much stronger had they applied their criteria of democracy more fully and systematically to the varied panaceas advocated by the so-called "responsible party government" school.

Though the authors may not con-

vince all readers of the soundness of their position, none could ask for a clearer exposition of it.

ALLAN P. SINDLER

Half-Forgotten Lives

A Baker's Dozen: Thirteen Unusual Americans, by Russel B. Nye. 300 pp. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press. $5.00

Professor Nye, who is chairman of the department of English at Michigan State University, has given us a series of brief lives of American adventurers, traitors, eccentrics, and scoundrels. Although his very readable essays contribute nothing new in fact or interpretation to American biography, this is a worthwhile book because it condenses into small compass all that one needs to know about his subjects—with the possible exception, that is, of Clement Vallandigham, rather a bigger man than the others in this book. Several of these Americans have had whole books written about them, and Mr. Nye appends a good bibliography; but life being short, the reader as yet unacquainted with these gentry will be well advised if he contents himself with Professor Nye's sketches.

John Fries, of Rebellion notoriety; Blennerhassett, Burr's dupe; Ledyard, the traveller in Asia; Bonney, a lawyer turned thief-taker (his a brief life that entails some interesting reflections of life in the Middle West more than a century gone); Girty of the scalping-knife; Murrell the ambitious outlaw; Noyes the Utopian; "King" Streng the Michigan Mormon; Coxey with his Army; Nat Turner with his Virginia Mau-Mau; Lovejoy the Abolitionist; Quimby the forerunner of Christian Science: these are Mr. Nye's subjects of biography. It is not Professor Nye's fault that the careers and characters of most of his subjects were curiously flat, lacking in depth, so that a paper-doll quality afflicts this half-forgotten baker's dozen. After all, it is the life of the mind which makes biography interesting to us; and few of this thirteen enjoyed much life of the mind, in any deeper sense.

RUSSELL KIRK

To order any book reviewed in this book section, write:

THE BOOKMAILER

Box 101, Murray Hill Station
New York 16, N. Y.

Return mail service—postpaid

PAY ONLY BOOKSTORE PRICE

.....

$.....payment enclosed

Please send me: ..... (name of book)

.....

.....

Name .....

Address .....

.....

(No C.O.D. orders accepted; payment MUST accompany order. N.Y. City residents add 3% tax.)

Priest and Convert

The Bridge: A Yearbook of Judaeo-Christian Studies, Volume II, edited by John M. Oesterreicher. 357 pp. New York: Pantheon Books. $3.95

This is a remarkable book, edited by a Roman Catholic priest who is a convert from Judaism. Competence and scholarship here present fascinating subjects with the grace of a clear and often beautiful style. Father Oesterreicher, the author of *Walls are Crumbling,* has set a pattern of Judaeo-Christian relationship and reciprocal appraisal that leaves almost nothing to be desired.

The book is structured into five studies: 1) "The Word Is A Seed," a beautiful Christian interpretation of parts of the Old and New Testaments: 2) "The Mysterious Destinies of Israel," by the eminent Swiss theologian, Charles Journet; 3) "The Community of Qumran," in which the editor himself deals with aspects of the Dead Sea scrolls; 4) "The Painter and the Prophets," the painter being Michelangelo; and 5) "Dreyfus and After." Then follow five "Perspectives" (entitled respectively "The Genius of Biblical Thought," "Pro Perfidis Judaeis," "The Blessings of the Jewish Prayer Book," "Chaucer's Prioress: Mercy and Tender Heart" and "The Beasts and the Everlasting Love"); two "Surveys" ("Hope and Despair at Evanston" and "Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union"); and four book reviews (appraising Klausner's *The Messianic Idea in Israel;* Agus's *Guideposts in Modern Judaism;* Epstein's *An Autobiography* and Beaty's *The Iron Curtain over America*). All of them are characterized by insights and eloquence.

The very titles just rehearsed suggest the variety and scope of the topics. But mere titles can scarcely indicate the depths of wisdom and charity which these essays disclose.

GODFREY P. SCHMIDT

A Democracy Dies

The Last of the Wine, by Mary Renault. 389 pp. New York: Pantheon Books. $4.50

The story, told with a particularly human and dramatic quality, is of Athens during the period of the Peloponnesian War. It is the story of Alexias, a youthful athlete whose love affair with Lysis, a young man a few years his senior, may seem shocking to those unacquainted with Athenian sexual mores.

The reader also meets Socrates, Plato, Xenophon and others, and he meets them with an intimacy which lifts these greats out of the dryness of historical texts. We follow Socrates in his quest for goodness and Truth; we listen to his counsel; we witness his refusal to compromise with his principles. We come upon Plato as a young boy (and learn that the immortal name was only a nickname given a young wrestler, Aristokles).

With Alexias, we see and feel the drama and tragedy of Athens in the final days of its age of greatness; its culture and ideals; its weaknesses and mistakes; its wars, its agony, its defeat—all become real and immediate.

Many an analogy with the present might be drawn, as in a bit of dialogue near the beginning of the book: "What keeps the democracy alive at all but the hatred of excellence; the desire of the base to see no head higher than their own? . . . We shall be laming the best athletes soon, at the demand of the worst, in the name of justice."

Miss Renault has written a remarkable historical novel in which the death rattle of the world's first democracy may be heard throughout.

FRANCES BECK

To the Editor

Suez Situation

I have hesitated to assert my violent disapproval of the viewpoint on the Suez Canal. Our foreign policy in persuading Britain to withdraw last summer was eminently correct, consistent with our disapproval of colonialism. . . .

The discomfiture of Britain and France over the nationalization of the Canal was unrealistic in view of their own nationalized transportation systems. . . .

At the time of the Allied attack the Canal was functioning normally. Further, Nasser had warned that the Canal would be interdicted in such event. One expects brilliant stupidity from plausible politicians. What is appalling is the acquiescence of the British and French General Staffs.

However, no one, except Nasser, seems to have noticed that the Soviets failed to help him, as promised. In short, their bluff was called.

Los Angeles, Cal. TRELLYS CLYMER

The Weak-Willed West

The history of the past twenty years affords us numerous illustrations of the *Untergang des Abendlandes*—of the West's fading will to act resolutely. Few events point up the decline of our energy and (to use one of Machiavelli's favorite terms) *virtu*, more strikingly than our—and the UN's—reaction to the events in Hungary which the past six weeks have brought.

Just twenty-one years ago, the League of Nations met Mussolini's coup in Ethiopia with a vote declaring Italy to be an aggressor and with preparations for economic sanctions against her. Six weeks after the invasion of Ethiopia began, the League voted for the actual application of these sanctions. Of course, the measures taken were totally inadequate to the requirements of the situation. Yet the United Nations today will not even go as far against the USSR as the League of 1935 went against Italy.

Perhaps our seemingly weak-kneed attitude is in reality a triumph of "progress" rather than a sign of spiritual collapse. After all, a great many aspects of contemporary life would be intolerable, if it were not that they have the redeeming quality of representing "progress."

Baltimore, Md. J. D. FUTCH III

UN Shackles Freedom

That freedom and Communism cannot be united in Hungary has become evident to all. The conviction that they cannot be united in the United Nations is far less sweeping; this in spite of the fact that the forces of freedom have been shackled for eleven years by a United Nations dedicated, not to freedom, but to a spurious peace.

During the twenty-eight years of Soviet Communism from 1917 to 1945 Soviet sovereignty did not expand beyond its home boundaries. During the eleven years since 1945 the world, in the name of the peace of the United Nations, has permitted the sacrifice of seven hundred million souls to expanding slavery. Let this unholy union of Freedom and Slavery joined together by man be put asunder by God acting through free men endowed by Him with truth and courage.

Sonoma, Cal. ADM. CHARLES M. COOKE

Senator Knowland's Suggestions

Please give us some more straightforward answers such as suggested by Senator Knowland. There is no doubt that all the world outside the Russian orbit can and should feel very ashamed for past and present performances.

Reading these few lines together with what past experience we Spaniards have had with Communism contrasts ironically with the gush put out by *Time* December 17, page 24, title Hungary . . .

Buenos Aires CARLOS CARO

Feminine Viewpoint

Hey you, John W. Buckley of Lakeville, Connecticut [letter, Dec. 29]. I read Aloise Heath's letter, December 8, and—Courage, Aloise Heath, I am with you!

West Hartford, Conn. MAE HAYES

AMERICAN LITERATURE

(*Continued from p. 40*)

whether Miss Cather would have approved their being reprinted); Edmund Wilson's *A Piece of My Mind* (when a critic whom the reviewers profoundly admire says things which profoundly affront them, it seems to be the Liberal fashion right now to dismiss such deplorable sentiments as "crotchety"); and John Dos Passos' vivid, courageous, and vitally penetrating *The Theme Is Freedom* (an anthology of articles and excerpts from books he has written over the years).

The most tonic, certainly the most provocative and controversial, volume of literary criticism to appear in a critically lean year was John W. Aldridge's *In Search of Heresy*—a book shot through with fearless candor and rugged independence of judgment. I readily grant that the reader will also encounter many blind spots and decidedly questionable enthusiasms; but he should be more than glad to overlook them in these degenerate days when trenchant critics and even half-trustworthy reviewers are so hard to find.

Other outstanding volumes of literary criticism were Austin Warren's *New England Saints* (which contains an excellent study of Irving Babbitt); Lionel Trilling's *A Gathering of Fugitives*, and Jacques Barzun's *The Energies of Art*. (Taking the long view, George Santayana's *Essays in Literary Criticism*, edited by Irving Singer, was far and away the outstanding event in this department during the year.)

And we would be flagrantly remiss if, before concluding, we failed to mention Katherine Hulme's *The Nun's Story*, James Thurber's *Further Fables for Our Time*, Robert J. Niess' *Julien Benda* (an extraordinary work of genuine scholarship and genuine criticism), and Russell Kirk's *Beyond the Dreams of Avarice*.

Strictly speaking, several of the books listed immediately above may not come under the head of American Literature; but literature, today if ever, is where you find it; and one will frequently find more of it in a volume like *Beyond the Dreams of Avarice* than in a rapturously acclaimed novel or play whose author has been sloshing around in the Dreams of Freud these many years.